UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

55

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/457,228	12/08/99	MICHELSON	G	101.0084-000

EXAMINER	
SNOW, B	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3738	8

022882
MARTIN & FERRARO
14500 AVION PARKWAY
SUITE 300
CHANTILLY VA 20151-1101

QM12/1009

DATE MAILED: 10/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/457,228	
Examiner	**Art Unit**
Bruce Snow	3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-202 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☒ Claims 1-202 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
20) ☐ Other:

Response to Arguments

This action is in response to applicant's "Reply to Restriction Requirement", paper No. 7. It was noted by applicant that species 5, indicated as figure 19A, is an enlarged view of Figure 16 and should not be considered a different species to which the Examiner agrees. Species 5 is correctly shown in figure 19B.

Additionally, please clarify figure 17. It is unclear how figure 17 could be a side elevation of the implant shown in figure 16.

Note: the Examiner reserves the right to further restrict this application if deemed necessary or rejection on the grounds of multiplicity as defined in MPEP 2173.05(n).

The previous restriction requirement has been withdrawn, a corrected restriction requirement follows:

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

   I. Claims 1-120 and 131-202, drawn to spinal implant, classified in class 623, subclass 17.11.

   II. Claims 121-130, drawn to a method for forming an interbody spinal implant, classified in class 623, subclass 901.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are

distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process wherein the implant is provided with the surface projections not requiring the secondary step of "forming" the projections.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Election of Species

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

species 1 - figure 4

species 2 - figure 8

species 3 - figure 12

species 4 - figure 16

species 5 - figure 19B

species 6 - figure 20

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, none are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, **and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added or the response will be considered non-responsive**. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. Due to the complexity including multiply species and numerous claims, no call was made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce Snow whose telephone number is (703) 308-3255.

bes

October 2, 2001

BRUCE SNOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER